

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

By this Amendment, Claim 9 has been amended to more particularly recite subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in detail below. Claim 11 has also been amended for consistency. Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to reduce the issues. Claims 1-7, 12, 14, 18, and 20 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 8 and 21 currently stand as withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected inventions.

Thus, Claims 9, 11, 13, 15-17, and 19 are active pending.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (first paragraph); Claims 9-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Chamoff in combination with Sugiyama and Janssens; and Claims 15-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Chamoff, Sugiyama, Janssens in further combination with Fukunaga.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Claim 9 has been amended as suggested. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the amendments made to Claim 9 overcome the alleged informalities in the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is therefore respectfully requested.

Regarding the art-based rejections, without acceding thereto, Claim 9 has been amended to recite a method for exchanging information between a central system and a satellite system, which executes at least one operation of the central system, the method comprising a fourth step which includes sending a write command from the satellite

system to the central system identified by a second logical unit number and a second data block resulting from said operation, in which the first step is performed using a first directional link, the second step is performed using said first directional link, the fourth step is performed using a second directional link having a direction different from said first directional link, the first directional link is a downlink from said satellite system to said central system, and in which the second directional link is an uplink from said satellite system to said central system.

Support is provided, for example, at paragraphs [0021], [0022], abstract, and FIG. 1 of Applicants' English-language specification.

It is apparent that none of the applied references teaches or suggests at least the above-recited features.

First, primary reference Chamoff fails to teach or suggest a method for exchanging information between a central system and a satellite system where the satellite system executes at least an operation of the central system, as recited in Claim 9. Chamoff's system includes a media terminal 10 (assumed to be the central system) and satellite terminals 24, 34...40. However, Chamoff's satellite terminals do not execute an operation of the media terminal 10. Instead, Chamoff's satellite terminals are understood as executing their own individual operations and when polled, they transmit data to the media terminal 10 for permanent storage of data on diskette 20. The one terminal disclosed in Chamoff that could be possibly interpreted as executing an operation of the media terminal is the backup media terminal 40. However, this backup terminal 40 is not active in this capacity unless the media terminal 10 is disabled (malfunction, etc.).

Second, Chamoff, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action, fails to teach or suggest a first step including sending a read command from the

satellite system to the central system. It follows, of course, that Chamoff also fails to teach or suggest a second step including sending from the central system a first data block containing said operation in response to said read command, as recited in Claim 9.

Because there is no read command sent from the satellite system to the central system, the central system cannot send a data block to the satellite system in response to a non-existing read command, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action.

Additionally, Chamoff's read and write commands appear to be generated and initiated from the media terminal and not from the satellite terminals (see FIGS. 24-28 and associated description). Therefore, Chamoff fails to teach or suggest a fourth step including sending a write command from the satellite system to the central system identified by a second logical unit number and a second data block resulting from said operation. Figure 16 and the paragraphs cited by the Office as allegedly describing this feature do not appear to disclose a write command from the satellite system to the central system. Instead, the cited paragraphs and figure merely teach that a memory control 86 receives read/write signals from the local satellite microprocessor 60. However, contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, this local satellite microprocessor 60 is not part of a satellite terminal but is in fact part of the media terminal 10, and therefore, the write command is sent from one part of the media terminal 10 to another part of the media terminal 10, and not from a satellite terminal to the media terminal 10 (see Col. 9, lines 5-8, for example).

Moreover, none of the applied references teaches or suggests that the first step is performed using a first directional link, the second step is performed using said first directional link, the fourth step is performed using a second directional link having a direction different from said first directional link, where the first directional link is a

downlink from said satellite system to said central system, and the second directional link is an uplink from said satellite system to said central system, as recited in Claim 9. For example, Janssens only teaches a downlink from the CPU 1 to the communication stations and an uplink from the communication stations to the CPU 1. Therefore, Janssens fails to teach at least a downlink from the satellite system to the central system used to perform both first and second steps and an uplink from the satellite system to the central system used to perform the fourth step.

In addition, as previously shown, Fukunaga is directed to an information processing apparatus and storage medium. *See* Fukunaga, Abstract. Accordingly, Fukunaga is not understood as teaching or suggesting a satellite system at all.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 distinguishes patentably from the applied references.

Dependent Claims 11, 13, 15-17, and 19 are also believed to be patentable due at least to their dependence from Claim 9 as well as for the additional subject matter recited in Claims 11, 13, 15-17, and 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request a prompt Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-907751) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 19, 2010

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
Telephone: (703) 610-8647

By: /Otilia Gabor/
Eric G. King
Reg. No. 42,736

Otilia Gabor
Reg. No. 60,217